

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 8-9 and 11-15 are amended and claim 10 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for rejection. The specification enables one skilled in the art to make and/or use the features of dependent claims 2 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0016444 to Brown et al. (hereafter Brown). The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 4, 6, 10, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a flat display device displaying a plurality of perspective views from different directions, and a lenticular lens sheet including a plurality of lenticular lens pieces of which Y-axis being parallel to a vertical axis of the flat display, the plurality of lenticular lens pieces forming a plurality of lines parallel to a horizontal axis of the flat display device on a front surface of the flat display device, and each of the plurality of lines being shifted a predetermined distance. Independent claim 1 also recites that the plurality of lines have an odd line and an even line, a boundary region between a first lenticular lens piece and a second lenticular lens piece in

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2008

the odd line is positioned at a center region of a pixel of the flat display device, and a boundary region between a first lenticular lens piece and a second lenticular lens piece in the even line is positioned to an edge region of a pixel of the flat display device.

Brown does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Brown does not teach or suggest that the plurality of lines have an odd line and an even line, a boundary region between a first lenticular lens piece and a second lenticular lens piece in the odd line is positioned at a center region of a pixel of the flat display device, and a boundary region between a first lenticular lens piece and a second lenticular lens piece in the even line is positioned to an edge region of a pixel of the flat display device. See Brown's FIG. 7C. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites a flat display device displaying a plurality of perspective views taken from different directions, and a lenticular lens sheet including a plurality of lenticular lens pieces arrayed on a front surface of the flat display device in a horizontal direction, the arrayed lenticular lens pieces forming a plurality of lines parallel to a horizontal axis of the flat display device. Independent claim 8 also recites that a width P_h and a length P_v of the lenticular lens

piece is determined by the following equations, $P_h = \frac{3.5p(D-d)}{3D}$, and $P_v = \frac{p(D-d)}{D}$, where p

is a length of a pixel in the horizontal direction, D is a predetermined distance between a viewer and the flat display device, and d is a distance between the flat display device and the lenticular lens sheet.

Brown does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8. More specifically, Brown does not teach or suggest a width P_h and a length P_v of the lenticular lens

piece is determined by the following equations, $P_h = \frac{3.5p(D-d)}{3D}$, and $P_v = \frac{p(D-d)}{D}$.

Additionally, these features are not merely a design choice. Rather, the specification describes advantages of the claimed features which are not recognized by the prior art. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1 and 8 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-15 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/790,226**

Docket No. **K-0615**

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2008

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: December 12, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610